

Application No. 09/494,801
Amendment dated November 20, 2003
Reply to Examiner's Answer dated September 26, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,366,933 (Ball et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 5,142,619 (Webster, III) and are presently on appeal. Appeal is not presently being pursued in favor of amendment. For example, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Further, new claims 23-26 have been added. Claims 23-26 are similar to claims 21-23, which were canceled in a prior reply to put the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal.

Claim 1 has been amended to call for enabling a processor-based system to difference a cached version and a current version of an Internet web page, the current version being provided to a web browser on the processor-based system from a web server for the web page. It is respectfully submitted that Ball fails to disclose supplying an Internet web page to a web browser for differencing. For example, Ball's service is external to, or remote from both system that the user is working at and the web server that originally provided the web page. Further, Ball specifically states that certain components of his service do not interact with web browsers. Column 20, lines 54-56. Thus, the user of Ball's service can view a web page either via a browser without differencing, or through Ball's external service. Column 20, lines 54-65.

In contrast, some embodiments of the present invention may be implemented in a web browser or a plug-in that operates with an existing web browser. Thus, differencing may be performed as a result of the user's selection of a subtract icon on the browser window navigation bar. Clearly, Ball fails to disclose a web page being provided to a web browser for differencing. Thus, for at least this reason, claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom are believed to be patentable over Ball in view of Webster. For similar reasons, claims 8, 15 and their respective dependent claims are also believed to be patentable over Ball in view of Webster.

Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,366,933 (Ball et al). Claims 21, 22 and 23 were amended (not entered) and then canceled in a prior response to office action. New claims 24-26 are similar to canceled claims 21-23 (as

Application No. 09/494,801
Amendment dated November 20, 2003
Reply to Examiner's Answer dated September 26, 2003


amended). New claim 24 calls for indicating the difference between the cached and current versions by blanking the common material between the cached and the current versions such that only new material in the current version is displayed.

It is respectfully submitted that Ball fails to disclose showing only new material in a current version of a web page. Instead, Ball shows all differences while eliminating the common part between two versions of a web page. See column 19, lines 1-11. In contrast, according to some embodiments of the present invention, only new material on a page and nothing more is displayed. As such, claim 24 is not believed to be anticipated by Ball. For similar reasons, new claims 25 and 26 are not believed to be anticipated by Ball.

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the prior rejections. In light of the amendments and arguments herein, it is respectfully urged that the claims are in condition for allowance and the application be allowed to pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2003



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024-1805
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No. 21906